

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-10 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7 and 10 are amended. No new matter has been added.

Support for amendment to claim 1 can be found at least in Table 2 on page 13 and at paragraph [0053]. Support for amendment to claim 7 can be found at least at paragraph [0068]. Support for amendment to claim 10 can found at least at paragraph [0053].

I. The Claims Satisfy 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. claim 10 is amended to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,074 to Bos et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,898 to Numano et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,160,535 to Park; claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,092,664 to Miyatake et al.; claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,339,459 to Ichikawa et al.; claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Bos in view of Numano and Park and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,040,890 to Sawada et al.; and claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sawada. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the applied art discloses the adjacent pixel electrodes are separated by a space (L) of 1-3 μm as in amended independent claim 1. Further, Numano teaches away from claim 1. Specifically, Numano discloses in col. 2, line 17 a distance L between adjacent electrodes is 2 to 5 μm . However, Numano further discloses that such a narrow space between pixel electrodes would result in a disclination, especially when the driving system that reverses polarity for each column is used. Thus, Numano teaches away from this feature.

None of the applied references teach or disclose a light modulating device that modulates light in a blue display portion and that the alignment film includes one of a silicon oxide and silicon nitride, as in amended independent claim 7. Blue light defers from red or green as it includes a larger percent of ultraviolet light. Therefore, by forming alignment film for blue color from the above inorganic materials, the alignment film for blue light can be prevented from breaking down by the ultraviolet light. Further, the other colors can be made from organic material, such as polyimide, without worrying of breakdown by ultraviolet light. Thus, none of the applied references teach or suggest this feature.

Finally, none of the applied references teach or suggest the pixels that are adjacent to each other being applied with voltages having different polarity, as recited in claims 1 and 10.

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/fpw

Date: December 7, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--